



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/437,579	11/09/1999	ALEXANDER G. MACINNIS	36275/SAH/B6	8181

7590

06/24/2002

John A Wiberg  
McAndrews Held & Malloy  
500 W Madison Street  
Suite 3400  
Chicago, IL 60661

EXAMINER

TUNG, KEE M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2671

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

APPLICATION NUMBER	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED APPLICANT	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
--------------------	-------------	-----------------------	---------------------

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

22

DATE MAILED:

INTERVIEW SUMMARY

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Kee Tung (EX.) (3) \_\_\_\_\_  
(2) John Wiberg (Att) (4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview 6/20/02

Type: ☒ Telephonic ☐ Personal (copy is given to ☐ applicant ☐ applicant's representative).

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: ☐ Yes ☐ No If yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_

Agreement ☐ was reached. ☒ was not reached.

Claim(s) discussed: 1, 29, 30 and 61

Identification of prior art discussed: Ben - Joseph et al ('439)

Description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Wiberg argues Ben-Joseph fails to suggest the graphics accelerator transfers processed and unprocessed data between main mem and local mem while block of graphics data is being processed as recited in claims 29, 30 and 61. The examiner will reconsidered upon received of the after Final response. Regarding claims, the examiner strongly disagreed with Mr. Wiberg.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

1. ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.

Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary. A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.

2. ☐ Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an attachment to another form.

Kee M. Tung  
Primary Examiner